

## **Hunters Point DRA Briefing**

**Friday, May 11, 2018, 10:30 am**

### **Suggested Agenda**

1. Supervisor Hearing – Key Messages
  - a. We stand by our prior statement that we do not believe that any current residents at Parcel A and any current workers anywhere at the Shipyard are at risk due to Tetra Tech's actions. New information recently came to our attention regarding Parcel A, and we will fully investigate that information and share the results of our analysis publicly.
  - b. We will not approve any new development without thorough rework with proper oversight to ensure future residents and workers would be safe.
  - c. We are committed to working hard to efficiently resolve the uncertainty for the benefit of the community.
2. Parcel A – Residential neighborhood already partially occupied
  - a. Concerns from press/public
  - b. Interview whistleblowers
  - c. Next steps
3. Parcel G Resampling Workplan – next parcel scheduled for transfer
  - a. Navy proposals
  - b. HQ followup
  - c. Next steps
4. Other issues
  - a. DoJ enforcement actions
  - b. Landfills

### ***SF Chronicle and SF Curbed articles regarding Parcel A***

- New allegations from former workers about Parcel A
  - Manhole in 2004 had elevated levels of Ra-226 that the Navy knew about but ignored
  - Tetra Tech EC backfilled excavated areas with soil that was suspect
  - In February 2018, sludge from the shoreline of the landfill with a history of radiological contamination was dumped onto Parcel A
- Previous reassurances not convincing
  - EPA's previous rad scanner van study was limited
  - The Cs-137 hit downhill from Parcel A could have come from contamination on Parcel A
  - No comprehensive scanning for rad was ever done at Parcel A
- Public call to test all of Parcel A - If we have nothing to hide, why not scan?
  - Technical challenges in establishing background levels and in differentiating fallout from contamination
  - Results could lead to public confusion, and agency explanations of results may not be satisfactory
  - Agencies have been criticized for relying on incomplete site history for decision not to do comprehensive survey of radiological contamination on Parcel A.